

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the treaty than from any of the other works which have fallen under the present reviewer's eye.

Five maps and an index are supplied. The presswork is unusually good, only two typographical errors having caught the writer's eye—"November 3" for *November 4*, as the date of the Austro-Italian armistice, and "Gourand" for *Gouraud* [pp. 91 and 200].

It is easy to perceive that the authors are of varying schools of thought in politics, history and international relations; and equally clear that no effort has been made to subordinate a writer's opinions to those of the American commissioners or of the editors. The several authors do not hesitate to take issue with the wisdom of a given view of their chiefs (or of the Conference), but the book is singularly and surprisingly free from the attribution of improper motives to those with whom one disagrees.

The object and tenor of the collection can best be expressed by Colonel House's own words in the last paragraph of the final chapter:

> The world at large gave prompt and generous praise to our diplomatic, military and naval efforts. But we were not content to let their righteous judgments go unchallenged; in public and in private we have told of our shortcomings in terms so convincing that others have come to see us as we seem to see ourselves. The object of this book is to tell something of the American purposes at the Conference, and let our people form a more deliberate opinion as to "What Really Happened at Paris."

MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR.
*Hamilton College.*

*The Truth About the Treaty.* By ANDRÉ TARDIEU. Foreword by Edward M. House. Introduction by Georges Clémenceau. Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1921, 473 pp.

Let it be said at once that M. Tardieu has written an intensely interesting and very readable account of the historic months during which the representatives of the Allied powers drafted the treaties which brought the World War to an end.

The title of the book is a challenge. It is not that M. Tardieu misrepresents the facts, but it is obvious that the relative importance of facts seen through French eyes is quite different from that seen through British or American eyes. M. Tardieu leaves

one with the impression that the claims of France were always reasonable and just and that M. Clémenceau was always in the right. The author has slight patience with such critics of the treaty as Mr. Keynes, whom he dismisses as one having "neither imagination nor character."

Of the three outstanding figures at the conference, Clémenceau, Wilson and Lloyd George, the author paints quite a different picture from that depicted by Mr. Keynes. Instead of the "bamboozled Presbyterian" portrayed by the English critic, M. Tardieu presents Mr. Wilson as a keen logician who discussed the many vexed problems which arose "like a college professor criticising a thesis." Mr. Lloyd George "argued like a sharp-shooter," while M. Clémenceau "proceeded by assertions weighty, rough-hewn and insistent, but clothed with gentle words that did him credit and refulgent with emotion which at times was overpowering."

M. Tardieu disposes of the charge that Mr. Wilson reached Paris with preconceived and doctrinaire views which he forced the unwilling Allies to accept.

> What remains of the fiction believed by so many of an armistice secretly determined upon by an American dictator; submitted to by European governments; imposed by their weakness upon the victorious armies despite the opposition of the generals?—It was to the Commander-in-Chief that final decision was left not only on the principle of the Armistice but upon its application. He it was who drew up the text. The action of the governments was limited to endorsing it and making it more severe. That is the truth: it is perhaps less picturesque but certainly more in accord with common sense.

On the question of the indemnity, M. Tardieu entertains no doubt of Germany's ability to pay the full amount demanded by the Allies. He quotes figures and statements from German sources to show that German industry was not seriously dislocated by the war.

In his concluding chapter, entitled "France, Great Britain and the United States," the author makes a strong plea for a union of the three great democracies as the surest means of maintaining the peace of the world. In treating of the rejection of the treaty by the United States Senate, M. Tardieu obviously writes under restraint in attempting to conceal his disappointment. He is under no illusions in regard to the fancied isolation of this country.

If the United States hesitates and seeks her own way, let her thoughts turn to the valley of the Argonne, where thirty thousand

white crosses bear witness to what America stood for in times of danger. America has not changed. America must make good the things she stood for, and she is free to choose her means. That is the problem of today. If it is not solved, peace of any kind will be unsafe. The dead will have died in vain.

NELSON P. MEAD,
*College of the City of New York.*

*Russia in the Shadows.* BY H. G. WELLS. New York, G. H. Doran Co., 1921, 179 pp.

*The Russian Bolshevik Revolution.* BY E. A. ROSS. New York, The Century Co., 1921, 302 + xvi pp.

The present-day book market is flooded with literature about Russia; most of it can be classified into three groups: (1) the ex-parte writings of extremists, who either hate and attack Bolshevism or tenderly defend it (such books have usually no historical value whatever); (2) the stories of witnesses who have been recently in Russia; and (3) explanations and interpretations of what is happening in this poor distracted country; sometimes authors combine the two last methods. The volume of H. G. Wells, that recently created such a sensation, does this, distinctly to the detriment of the narrative. All critics of Wells seem to agree that there exists a striking contradiction between his descriptions of the facts he has seen during his very short stay in Russia and his logical deductions. His descriptions are perfect, gruesome and appalling as they are; he gives a frightful picture of the economic and cultural collapse of Russia. Wells was so terrified by what he saw in Russia that he became alarmed for the whole civilized world, lest something like that would threaten elsewhere. This alone is a severe indictment of Bolshevism.

The author gives an entertaining criticism of the Marxian doctrine, biting and true, but the interview he had with Lenine seems very disappointing and uninteresting. His main conclusion is that the Bolshevik system, deficient and wrong as it is, is the only possible one in the present-day Russia. Events will soon prove how wrong he is in this respect; this volume will then drop into deserved oblivion.

The book of Professor Ross has neither the charm nor the merits of the narrative of Wells; though Professor Ross has been in Russia a longer time than Wells, he evidently saw less and then, too, his visit took place so long ago (1917) that since then things have utterly changed, and hardly anything is left in the